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The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviews Target of Excellence (TOE) waiver of open recruitment requests. Waivers of open recruitment are “meant to provide an exceptional hiring strategy for academic units to pursue or retain extraordinary faculty, where it is clear that such faculty would improve the overall excellence of UCSC, while at the same time meeting a high priority in the department or division” (CAPM 101.000 policy).¹ Waivers of open recruitment are and should remain infrequent, and use of the campus waiver policy should not circumvent open recruitment processes.

This document is intended to clarify how CPB evaluates TOE waiver of open recruitment proposals. CPB guidelines for review reflect campus policy (see CAPM 101.000). Given that TOE waiver proposals reviewed by CPB have varied considerably in scope and quality, we have developed these guidelines to encourage proposals to consistently address the requirements as outlined in campus policy and to clarify the committee’s review process.

The Case for Excellence
TOE recruitments are, by definition, exceptional. The case made by department and division should thus be particularly attentive to the significance of the candidate’s contribution to campus excellence. Of course, excellence takes many forms and may include the potential to bring resources to campus through high-impact research, grants, reputation, or graduate capacity.

As required by CAPM policy, the request must make clear how the proposed TOE hire would benefit the requesting department or division, and the campus as a whole. Policy also requires that a TOE candidate be an eminent scholar of outstanding quality, possess a unique and distinguished record in all aspects of professorial activities (research/creative work, teaching, and service) relative to the proposed appointment level, would bring prominence to the department, division, and/or campus, and would contribute to diversity at UCSC through research/creative work, teaching, and/or service.

Including the candidate’s CV and two or three sample publications (as required by CAPM 101.000) in the package is essential, as it will help CPB better understand the arguments made in favor of the hire. For proposals in the Lecturer SOE series, include evaluations and course materials and commentary on the candidate’s overall teaching effectiveness as specified by CAPM 101.000.

Complete proposals are also required to include a discussion of the diversity contributions or potential contributions (in research/creative work, teaching, and/or service) of the candidate (in department and dean letters). TOE proposals must also include a candidate diversity statement.

Justification of a Waiver of Open Recruitment
The request must explain the need for a waiver of open recruitment, and include relevant details of how the TOE opportunity arose. As required by CAPM 101.000 (1.b), requests must explain “why the individual would no longer be available if an open recruitment was conducted.”

Departmental and Divisional Consultation²
The hiring department must approve all TOE waiver requests. CPB recommends that a formal vote on the waiver request be taken, in which case it should be shared with CPB. This vote is not to be confused with the

¹ See UCSC policy on Waivers of Open Recruitment for Senate Faculty positions: http://apo.ucsc.edu/policy/capm/101.000.html
² All references to divisions should be interpreted to include both academic divisions and schools
eventual Bylaw 55 vote taken on the appointment itself, if the waiver is approved. It may also be useful for the dean to consult with, or at least inform, other deans and department chairs of the request; their written support or support reported in the decanal letter would enhance the case of a TOE who brings interdisciplinary strengths. Evidence of this wider support is critical if the proposed appointment would be a divisional rather than a departmental appointment.

If the proposed appointment is to be a divisional appointment, the assessments called for in CAPM 101.000 Section C.1.a apply at the divisional level and must include a discussion how the hire fits within divisional plans.

**Impact on Existing Plans**

The purview of CPB includes academic planning as well as budget. Both the dean and department chair must discuss the way the hire fits within the scope of existing plans. This is extremely important for the assessment by CPB. Does it meet the criteria of a recruitment already listed in divisional plans? Of course, a true TOE can transform the focus of a field or department, and so enable improvements to existing plans. A shift in priorities may well be warranted to seize unexpected opportunities. However, emphasizing one priority area necessitates de-emphasizing other previous priorities, and that trade-off must be discussed. It is critical that requests articulate how preexisting plans will be affected, so that CPB can understand and evaluate what the opportunity costs of such decisions would be; that is, given the current environment of limited resources, what previously articulated priorities would be sacrificed in pursuit of unexpected opportunities presented by TOE? Regardless of how plans are affected, the impact of the TOE on future hiring plans must be explained.

**Resource Implications**

Which budgeted FTE provision (or equivalent funds) is to be used for the proposed hire and startup package? What, if anything, would be foregone by allocating the FTE for this TOE as opposed to an open recruitment? To the extent that the TOE hire alters existing plans, the resources released or (more likely) encumbered must be identified.